

Agreement, CAFT agreement, that does not protect against piracy of copyright. Well and good. Who determines that? How does it get determined? How do we know if we are making sufficient progress during the negotiations to know whether or not we could be expending any funds that does not open markets for the United States agricultural products and high technology and other manufactured products.

Does that mean that only if it opens markets for our products? Does it mean it cannot open our doors for products from other countries coming into the United States? Is this supposed to be just under this? Is USTR supposed to assume it has to be a one-way trade agreement that is to be negotiated, that provides for greater rights for foreign investors? What are greater rights? What does that mean? Cannot provide for greater rights for foreign investors than U.S.? Do we have to compare each tax law? How do we compare the tax laws as opposed to our own tax laws? How are they supposed to know?

The point of all of this, Mr. Chairman, the point that I am trying to make here, is that what we are talking about here is a negotiating process. We are talking about the U.S. Trade Representative entering into a negotiation. And when you enter into negotiations, you cannot prejudge and say that at the outset it has to be better than it was before in all agricultural products. It has to provide for more protection for U.S. investors than for other investors.

And how are they supposed to know day by day during this negotiation whether they are allowed to expend funds?

It is a completely unworkable kind of amendment that is being offered here today. So just on the surface of this amendment it is something that could not really possibly work. The bottom line is we all want to have protection for investors, protection for copyrights, open access to markets in other countries.

But we are also talking about some of the least developed countries, certainly, in this hemisphere, some of the lesser-developed countries in the world. And part of what we want to do with these trade agreements is give them an opportunity to have economic growth, give them an opportunity to hope for the future, give them a hand up, not a hand out, hold our hand out to them with open trade, with open markets; not to keep giving them more assistance that only robs them of the ability to send their markets, send their products to our markets.

That, Mr. Chairman, is what we are talking about with these free trade agreements.

I am reminded finally of how the head of the international labor organizations at one time with the group of members of this body was being questioned about labor rights and what

kind of labor rights should exist in other countries; and he finally said, We want jobs, of course, we want good jobs in these Latin American countries, but first we have to have the job before we can talk about how we protect that job, before we can talk about having worker protections and building on that and making those jobs better and providing for more rights for our workers. First, we have to have the jobs.

□ 2215

That is what we are talk about with CAFTA and the FTAA. We are talking about providing these jobs for people there, giving them a chance, giving them hope for the future. Let us not rob them of that hope. Let us not do the Central American Free Trade Agreement; let us not do the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas with an amendment like this.

Tomorrow we will make our points of order on the issue itself as to whether this amendment should be in order.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time except for the 1 minute that remains.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OSE) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2799) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO RAISE QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I hereby notify the House of my intention to offer a resolution as a question of the privilege of the House. The form of my resolution is as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION—

Whereas during a meeting of the Committee on Ways and Means on July 18, 2003, for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1776, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

Whereas during the reading of that amendment the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee directed majority staff of the committee to ask the United States Capitol Police to remove minority-party members of the committee from a room of the committee during the meeting, causing the United States Capitol Police thereupon to confront the minority-party members of the committee;

Whereas pending a unanimous-consent request to dispense with the reading of that amendment the chairman deliberately and improperly refused to recognize a legitimate and timely objection by a member of the committee;

Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives disapproves of the manner in which Representative Thomas summoned the United States Capitol Police to evict minority-party members of the Committee on Ways and Means from the committee library, as well as the manner in which he conducted the markup of legislation in the Committee on Ways and Means on July 18, 2003, and finds that the bill considered at that markup was not validly ordered reported to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Michigan will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

PLAN COLOMBIA/ANDEAN COUNTERDRUG INITIATIVE SEMI-ANNUAL OBLIGATION REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108-104)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Consistent with section 3204(e), Public Law 106-246, I am providing a report prepared by my Administration detailing the progress of spending by the executive branch during the first two quarters of Fiscal Year 2003 in support of Plan Colombia.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 22, 2003.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1308, TAX RELIEF, SIMPLIFICATION, AND EQUITY ACT OF 2003

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, subject to rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 1308, the Child Tax Credit bill. The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1308 be instructed as follows:

One, the House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report